

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 18, 19, 28 and 29 are pending in the above-identified application. In the non-final office action dated December 15, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 18-19, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Shimizu* in view of *Allen, et al.* (“*Allen*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below. Claims 28 and 29 have each been amended to clarify that the nozzles are formed on a single nozzle plate.

Referring to Applicants’ Figures 1 and 3 for illustrative purposes, independent claims 1, 5, 6, 18, 28, and 29 each claim subject matter relating to a print head 21 having a plurality of nozzles 31 formed within a plurality of nozzle arrays (array nozzles labeled 1-7) positioned on a single nozzle plate 23. The plurality of nozzles 31 are associated with a head chip 25. The nozzles 31 associated with one head chip 25 and nozzles associated with an adjacent head chip partly overlap along at least one direction to form an overlapped area on a print object such that when the at least one ink-ejecting mechanism drives across the print object the nozzles of the one head chip and the nozzles of the adjacent head chip respectively eject inks which are mixed in the overlapped area to reduce dot density differences on the print object. Applicants’ claimed single nozzle plate is illustratively shown as item 23 in Figure 23.

This is clearly unlike *Shimizu* in view of *Allen*, which fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ claimed printer head having a single nozzle plate. Referring to *Shimizu* Figures 2 and 3, *Shimizu* clearly teaches using multiple nozzle plates 231, 232, and 233. The plurality of nozzle plates 231, 232, and 233 are adhered to a common plate 234. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Shimizu*’s common plate 234 is unlike Applicants’ claimed single nozzle plate.

Shimizu's common plate 234 is merely a supporting structure. *Office Action of 12/15/2005*, page 3.

Allen also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed printer head having a single nozzle plate. Referring to *Allen* Figure 1a, *Allen* teaches a plurality of nozzle members 18 that are stacked together to make up a printer head 10. Each nozzle member 18 includes a nozzle plate. Thus, as clearly shown in *Allen* Figure 1a, *Allen's* printer head 10 includes a plurality of nozzle plates, one nozzle plate for each nozzle member 18. So, *Allen's* printer head 10 in Figure 1a includes at least four nozzle plates.

The Examiner argues that the width of *Allen's* nozzle member 18 may be increased. However, it appears that the Examiner has failed to recognize that *Allen* also teaches that *Allen* uses a plurality of nozzle members 18 to span the width of a print object. Thus, regardless of how wide each nozzle member 18 is, there are a plurality of nozzle members 18. And each nozzle member 18 includes a nozzle plate. Therefore, *Allen* always includes a plurality of nozzle plates.

Therefore, *Shimizu* in view of *Allen* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 5, 6, 18, 28, and 29.

Claims 3, 4, 7 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 6 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 6 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

Response to December 15, 2005 Office Action

Application No. 10/614,571

Page 9

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 15, 2006

By: Christopher P. Rauch
Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000